The Credibility Barrier: Why Silence on Perpetrator and Victim Data Fails Abuse Research

Methodological Radicalism: The Necessity of Disclosing Perpetrator and Victim Data for the Scientific Analysis of Institutional Abuse

The scientific analysis of historical and systemic child abuse faces a fundamental conflict between the protection of personal data and the demand for empirical truth-seeking. The method of radical openness, applied to the documentation of individual life histories, offers a decisive solution.

1. The Deficiency of Anonymization in Research

In previous literature concerning institutional abuse, the names of both victims and perpetrators were typically anonymized or withheld. This practice, while ethically motivated by data protection, leads to a critical credibility deficit and severely restricts scientific usability:

Lack of Verifiability: Anonymous reports cannot be embedded within the historical, political, or sociological context, which makes empirical verification or comparison with existing archival data impossible.

Absence of Proof: The omission of hard facts (date, location, full names) reduces the documentation to a literary or anecdotal level, rendering it insufficient for systematic research—which relies on verifiable causalities.

2. The Ethically Grounded Rationale for Disclosure

Providing a life's work as scientific source material necessitates a new ethical consideration that prioritizes the need for research over the protection of perpetrators:

Deceased Perpetrators: In cases where the alleged abusers are deceased and were never held accountable (neither legally nor morally), the primary reason for their protection ceases to exist. Truth-seeking and the provision of evidence for future research must take priority in this vacuum.

Generation of Highest Credibility: Documented disclosure based on the author's own initiative, which goes beyond what even public institutions attempt due to fear of liability or scandal, generates the

highest signal of credibility. This demonstrates the author's seriousness in providing an indispensable factual basis for science.

3. Methodological Conclusion

For the complete and scientifically sound analysis of child abuse, it is methodologically essential to overcome anonymization and disclose the full names of victims and perpetrators, provided this is ethically justifiable (e.g., due to deaths). Only in this way is the document transformed from a literary narrative into a Primary Source with the highest empirical value for interdisciplinary research.

About the Author

Peter Siegfried Krug is an Austrian FIDE Master (FM) in Chess Composition and an author. His work is centered on system-critical analysis and the relentless pursuit of creative mastery against all odds.

Mission: This work serves the explicit, altruistic purpose of providing future scientists and researchers with the factual basis to study the long-term impact of institutional life and child maltreatment. He is the Life Partner of Lucia Nadia Cipriani.

Academic Anchor: This analysis is also available on Academia.edu as a key methodological paper.